

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ALBANY DIVISION**

**W. DEXTER HARRISON,**

Petitioner,

v.

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

Respondent.

**1:09-cv-90051 (HL)**

28 U.S.C. § 2255

**1:07-cr-45-003 (HL)**

**ORDER**

Before considering the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 620), the Court wishes to clarify the issue of objections. Petitioner Harrison's counsel did not file an objection within the objection period, which ended on May 3, 2012. However, Harrison did submit a pro se Motion to Reconsider and Revise the Magistrate's Report (Doc. 630) on May 2, 2012, within the objection period. In the text of the Motion, Harrison indicates that his Motion could be construed as an objection. He states:

[a]t first glance, these statements may appear to be in the nature of objections to the magistrate's report, but further exploration of them will reveal that these are as much directed towards flaws in his premises as directed at the reasonableness of his recommendations. Therefore, by raising the challenges in this motion, Mr. Harrison seeks to focus the magistrate's attention as a prelude to formal objections.

(Doc. 630, p. 1-2.) However, Petitioner is represented by counsel and, as a result, the Court will not consider Harrison's pro se Motion as a formal objection.

“A district court has no obligation to entertain pro se motions filed by a represented party.” U.S. v. Holt, 2009 WL 1241080 at \*1 (M.D. Ga. May 4, 2009).

In light of the Court’s refusal to consider Harrison’s Motion to Reconsider and Revise the Magistrate’s Report as an objection, the Court, in an excess of caution, finds that Harrison’s counsel should be given another opportunity to file an objection to the Report and Recommendation. Counsel has an additional two weeks to file an objection, or until Friday, July 27, 2012. No extensions will be granted.

**SO ORDERED**, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012.

**s/ Hugh Lawson**  
HUGH LAWSON, SENIOR JUDGE

ebr